DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 179 449 SO 012 149

AUTHOR Redfield, Robert
TITLE Education and the Social Sciences.
SPONS AGENCY American Anthropological Association, Washington, D.C.; National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Apr 64
NOTE 32p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Anthropology; *Cultural Awareness; Educational Needs; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Social Science Research; Social Studies; Teacher Education; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS *Anthropology Curriculum Study Project; *Educational Role

ABSTRACT

The document contains three essays, written in the 1940s, about the role of the social studies in general education. The first considers the significance of social science research. An understanding of what is involved when a social problem is studied scientifically is a major element in modern general education. Also, every student should know that there is a social science as distinct from common-sense knowledge about society and social reform. Direct participation of students and teachers in social science research is suggested. The second essay discusses the significance of the concept of an integrated culture to education. An integrated culture is one in which all parts (customs, institutions) contribute to the functioning of the whole. One contribution is that the student can understand that human beings are reared in societies with ways of life characteristic of that society. The significance of the concept to teachers is that teaching itself is an element in an integrated society. Also, in a modern, non-integrated society, the teacher is the perpetrator of old integration and a builder of the power to meet disintegration. The third essay briefly discusses two elements of general education provided by the social studies and concentrates on a third. The first two are historical knowledge of the development of our values and analytical understanding of facts and assumption relevant to reasoned convictions. The third is the analysis of social concepts. This element may be realized through the study of a specific culture. The essay concludes with suggestions for implementing such a study. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED179449

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EDUCATION AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Essays by Robert Redfield

RESEARCH IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES:
ITS SIGNIFICANCE FOR GENERAL EDUCATION

A CONTRIBUTION OF ANTHROPOLOGY
TO THE EDUCATION OF THE TEACHER

THE STUDY OF CULTURE IN GENERAL EDUCATION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Mary Louise Charles, NSF
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP 012 149

An Occasional Paper of the
ANTHROPOLOGY CURRICULUM STUDY PROJECT
5632 Kimbark Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60637

Published in April, 1964, by the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project which is sponsored by the American Anthropological Association and supported by the National Science Foundation.

Previously published in *The Social Uses of Social Science. The Papers of Robert Redfield,* Volume II, by the University of Chicago Press. © 1963 by the University of Chicago. All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America.

RESEARCH IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES: ITS SIGNIFICANCE FOR GENERAL EDUCATION

A fable, which Aesop somehow neglected to record, tells of a hen who was making an effort to instruct her chicks about their future sources of food supply while she and they were balanced precariously on a chicken coop which was being carried down a river by a flood. It was a long time since the hen had studied the forests on the bank, and the account she was giving her chicks of forest resources was none too good. So she called to a wise owl on the bank for help. "You know the woods, oh owl, for you stay in this forest and study it," said the hen. "Will you not tell me what to teach my chicks about life in the forest?" But the owl had overheard what the hen had been telling the chicks about the forest as she came along, and he thought it was scientifically inaccurate and superficial. Besides, he was just then very busy completing a monograph on the incidence of beetle larvae in acorns. So he pretended he had not heard the hen. The hen, turned back upon herself, proceeded as well as she could to prepare and put into effect an instruction unit on the food resources of oak forests, meanwhile struggling to keep the chicks from falling off the chicken coop. The chicks took the instruction very well, and later the chicken coop stopped at a point far downstream, and the chicks all went ashore—to begin their adult lives in a treeless meadow.

The problems of the teaching of social science in connection with general education are chiefly two: how to get the owls to help the hens and the hens to make use of what they learn from the owls; and how to take account of the fact that the chicken coop is constantly being carried along the current of events. The first problem is chiefly one of effective organization. Effective organization will help to solve the second problem too, but only if it rests upon a sound philosophy of general education and an understanding of the place of social science in general education. The first problem I will here merely state and then will applaud some recent steps taken to deal with it. To the second problem I can hope to contribute only my own views as to what there is in social science that is most significant for a general education.

The need for closer collaboration between social scientists and teachers of the social studies arises from a number of circumstances. Among these is the demand that has come from educators for an education that deals with contemporary social life. This demand was early filled by a trivial sort of instruction in current events. More recently the tendency has been to organize instruction in the social studies around social problems, that

Reproduced with permission from *Social Education*, V (December, 1941), 568–74.

is, around topics of wide current practical importance to our citizens. In the meantime, the more theoretical social sciences, emphasizing research, have grown in power and competence in the universities and have exerted some influence on the curriculum of the secondary schools and junior colleges. But what little science of government, economics, and sociology has entered the intermediate educational institutions has got there by a sort of osmosis through the cell-walls of school and college.

There has been no organization of social scientist and teacher to deal with the problem. Indeed, the collective wills and interests of the two groups have remained diverse. The social scientists are, on the whole, disinterested in general education and seldom take pains to develop secondary school teachers. The teachers are rarely specialists in those frontiers of social science where new knowledge is won. To the teacher, the social scientist is inaccessible, unco-operative, and ignorant of the problems of teaching. To the social scientist, the teacher of the social studies is confused, superficial, and inclined to debase the currency of science. The teacher continues to write textbooks for the social studies which the social scientist condemns, while the social scientist continues to write monographs which the teacher can hardly read.

The teacher and the social scientist will come to develop common interests in the problem of the social studies and adequate ways to deal with it as they work together on enterprises connected with the problem.

A direct attack upon the problem was initiated by the General Education Board in the spring of 1939 when it invited a group of social scientists interested in problems of social-science education to meet with a few experts in the field of social-science education to discuss the possibilities of improvement in the teaching of the social studies. There resulted a printed document in which it was attempted to define the nature of a social problem and to illustrate the sort of contributions to general education which social scientists might make by formulating three sample social problems for the use of the teacher. In a second edition, this document was revised so as to retain only one of the three specific problems earlier chosen, that dealing with housing. The objective of the writers of the document was to show teachers of the social studies how social scientists of today define, analyze, and study a topic of scientific research that is also a problem for the citizen. The publication was used in, and subjected to criticism by, a number of social-science workshops. The entire enterprise was truly a collaboration between teacher and research worker, for it was the teacher who required that social-science knowledge be given in manageable units for consumption by the teachers and that the units coincide with problems of practical concern to the individual, while it was the social scientist who wrote out the definition of the problem and

showed how it was not merely a problem of action but a problem for scientific study.

The history and outcome of this enterprise are probably well known to most of you. You no doubt know that it was followed by action taken jointly by the National Association of Secondary-School Principals and the National Council for the Social Studies leading to the preparation of a series of what are now called "resource units" to be used by teachers in improving instruction in social-science fields.[1] These resource units are now being prepared under a grant from the General Education Board. They will later be tested in the schools. They will differ from teaching aids now issued by various publicity and pressure groups in that they will not attempt to indoctrinate any point of view. They will not be written to promote international peace or safe automobile driving or anything at all except intelligent understanding. They will differ from instruction units now published for the use of progressive schools chiefly in the fact that they will be prepared by leading scientists in the fields in which fall the topics selected. And they will emphasize—at least I hope they will emphasize—the characteristics of the problems selected that make them scientific problems. The analysis will make clear to the teacher and through him to the pupil how the social scientist objectifies that problem, looks all around it, and shapes methods for getting better understanding of it. The manuscript written by the research scientist will then be submitted to specialists in education for additional implementation to make them of the greatest possible use to teachers.

It really seems as if something is being done to bring the owls to the help of the hard-pressed hens. If this undertaking prospers and is followed by others like it, a great deal of what the owls know about acorns and other such subjects will be communicated to the hens, and, after proper translation into simplified clucking, which I am told is appropriate to chicks, will reach the chicks.

But meantime the chicken coop is going on down the river. Will there be any acorns when the chicks go ashore? Writing about the problem of bringing social-science knowledge to teachers in the intermediate schools, Professor Erling M. Hunt says that it "is further complicated by the unceasing change in subject matter to be taught due to new discoveries of scholars and research workers and to new developments in the political, economic, and social scene. Even if it were possible to prepare teachers for the social studies, they could not possibly keep abreast of new developments without help from specialists and popularizers."[2] I will add my

[1] *See* Paul B. Jacobson, "Resource Units for Teachers," *Social Education*, November, 1941.

[2] Louis Wirth (ed.), *Contemporary Social Problems* (2d ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940), p. vi.

opinion that it will be difficult to keep abreast even with all the help they can get and will add my advice that they do not try too hard to keep abreast in all subjects of the degree of particularity represented by acorns.

Any list of social problems which is selected will have to be revised at intervals that will not be very long. The list recently made in connection with the writing of resource units about which I have just been speaking begins with Democracy and Dictatorship and ends with Agriculture. It is certainly a timely list. It includes also American Defense and Recreation. It is a safe guess that as American Defense grows as a topic of current importance, that part of the subject of Recreation which deals with the use of leisure time is likely to decline in importance. And what the next five years are likely to do with the subject of Consumer Problems it would take a hardier prophet than I to venture to say. As there will certainly be consumers in 1946, there will be consumer problems; but will they be the same as face consumers today?

At last I find myself confronting the subject that was assigned to me to discuss. What is the significance of social-science research to a general education? I offer an answer that I believe simplifies the problem presented by the fact that we can't stop the chicken coop from going on down the river. I think that problem is only in lesser part met by the perfection of organizations which more promptly communicate to the teacher the results of research done by the expert. Such organizations will take advantage of the *particular* results of social-science research. But a more radical attack upon the problem, in my opinion, comes about when there is clarification of the *general* significance of social-science research for general education. I say that the primary significance of social-science research for general education lies in the nature of social-science research itself, as that method is applicable to any and all topics. I say that it is more important for teacher and pupil to understand that a social problem can be also a scientific problem and what universal considerations attend the scientific way to attack it than it is for them to be up to date on any chosen list of timely topics. I say that it is better for the chicks to understand that one can get objective, generalized, verifiable knowledge of either meadow or forest than it is for them to be up to the minute on what the owl has found out about acorns.

I am not saying that every citizen should be made a social scientist. Such a suggestion would be ridiculous. I am merely saying that one of the elements of a modern general education is understanding of what is involved when one studies a social problem scientifically, just as understanding of the great forms of literary expression or of the essential nature of matter and life is a part of a modern general education.

I am not saying that we should abandon instruction in the form of

units organized around practical problems of current interest. That method should be retained, because those subjects are both interesting and important. The demand will continue that we teach our young people about the problems of unemployment and public revenue and good government, and it is a desirable thing that they learn about these things. I am merely giving my opinion that there is something in the teaching of the social studies that is more important than having the right topics and more important than including in their treatment all the most recent knowledge on the field. It is more important that the nature of social science, its powers and limitations, be understood. This seems to me worth declaring because I do not believe that social problems are, on the whole, taught in high schools and junior colleges as scientific problems. I think they are chiefly taught to give information, or to awaken a social conscience, or to indoctrinate some point of view approved by some teacher's college committee or by public opinion. However desirable it may be to inform and to indoctrinate, neither information nor indoctrination is the contribution of social-science research to a general education.

A general education differs from a professional or a vocational education in that it is general. It is concerned with those aspects of knowledge which are relevant to all men and women and to many situations and experiences. The aspects of social-science research which have this general characteristic are recognizable in any well-conducted piece of social-science research, whether it deal with housing, population, business cycles, or the religious beliefs of the Navajo Indians. I will attempt to state some of them.

It is part of a general education to understand, in the first place, that there is a social science, as distinct from common-sense knowledge about society and as distinct from social reform. Every educated person should know that to a great extent society can be studied objectively and systematically, as can starfish or the action of glaciers. One can get impersonal, organized, verifiable knowlede about housing, crime, and race relations, as one can get such knowledge about any other phenomena of nature. An educated person will know how to distinguish the scientific way of attacking a social problem from those ways of attacking it which are more generally practiced around him. He will understand that in a great many instances people do something about a social problem because they feel badly about it rather than because they understand it and that what they do corresponds with their feelings rather than with the facts underlying the problem. He will understand that this is true, whether the action taken be to write a letter to the newspapers, to pass a law, or to demand changes in the school curriculum. It is a part of general education to understand that scientific knowledge is different from

feeling strongly about something and from common-sense knowledge and that it is a more secure basis for social action than either.

The successful teacher of the social studies will make clear to his pupils that there is a difference between the analysis of processes, which are matters of efficiency, and other objective judgments. The citizen must know what are his values, and he should understand how to act so as to protect or realize them. The uneducated person confuses values and processes, ends and means; a good education in social science will help to keep them distinct.

As a part of this understanding, the educated man or woman will have been taught that a social problem is not a simple thing. Social problems are closely intermeshed with one another. If one makes a beginning with the problem of housing, one finds that it is only one aspect of the larger problem of national insecurity. It is also related to the problem of the national income and to that of the national health. The solutions given in the form of new housing projects or in zoning laws encounter the problems of racial intolerance. It follows from this that a social problem does not mean the same thing to everybody. A striking feature of that memorandum on housing which was recently prepared as a first experimental resource unit for teachers of the social studies occurs in the introductory pages where it is pointed out that the problem of housing looks very differently to laymen, land-owners, builders, tax officials, and city planners, and where it is shown that full understanding of the problem depends upon special scientific knowledge of economists, sociologists, and students of government. The contribution of social-science research to a general education is not made use of when a social problem is presented to young people as if it existed with simple reference to some social ideal. It is not made use of if the problem is presented as if all one had to do was to take note of the social injustice attending the present state of things. That is not functional education; it does not prepare the young person for life.

A further contribution which social-science research can make to general education is the understanding that although social science is like physical or biological science in that it is objective, systematic description of the world around us, it differs from physical and biological science in that all the facts and all the problems are controversial. The social scientist is studying, chiefly, to put it strongly, himself, and one cannot help feeling and caring about one's self. We, as human beings, care about the institutions and social problems which the social scientist studies. Therefore it is harder for the social scientist to maintain objectivity than it is for the physicist, and it is harder for Society, with a capital "S," to keep from interfering with the social scientist than with the physicist. This is one of the elements of understanding of social-science research which be-

longs in a general education. If social problems are presented by the teacher of the social studies so as to communicate this general knowledge of the nature of social science it will be made clear to the learner that the mere facts of social science lie within a realm of controversy and prejudice. As Professor Wirth has pointed out,[3] even the number of people living in a given city of the United States is a controversial matter in the sense that if the city has been losing population the Chamber of Commerce will not want the fact to get abroad. The number of people unemployed in this country is a controversial fact, first, in the sense that various interest groups care as to what criterion is selected for determining who is unemployed, and, second, because even if it is decided who are unemployed, various groups will interpret the fact according to their interests. For some employers there will be just enough unemployed to assure a labor reserve, while for other of our citizens these same unemployed constitute a problem of providing relief.

At the same time the educated man or woman will understand that this special difficulty under which the social scientist labors has its compensation in a special advantage enjoyed by the social scientist and understanding of the nature of social-science research is not complete until another general characteristic of it is recognized. It is a peculiarity of the scientific method as applied to man in society that the investigator can get a more intimate knowledge of his subject matter than can the physicist of his, just because he is part of it. The physical scientist learns of his subject matter only as caliper and scales can tell him about it. The social scientist can ask questions of his subject matter and get answers, and he can project his own humanity imaginatively into the subject matter and so increase his understanding of it. The contribution of social-science research to a general education is provided in part by an understanding of the advantages and the dangers of this essential characteristic of social-science research. The social scientist does not abolish his own prejudices any more than he abolishes his own human nature. But he controls prejudice by making it explicit. So, too, he develops controlled use of his human insights. It is more important to a general education that the individual knows that there is a problem of using and controlling the human faculty of insight as a scientific instrument than that he know the latest facts with regard to any problem studied by that method.

I say again that the primary significance of social-science research for a general education lies in the nature of social science. The nature of social science can not be taught in abstract terms. It is conveniently and

[3] In "Biases in Education for Business," *Business Education for What?* Proceedings of the University of Chicago Conference on Business Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940), p. 2.

appropriately taught in connection with particular social problems. I think that it can also be taught by direct participation of teacher—and ultimately of the young student too—in elementary sorts of social-science research. The way to do this is pointed out to us by the recent development of the workshop as a method of instruction of teachers and other mature people. When Jones looks at the social world immediately around him and at the problems with which Jones has to deal, objectively, and relates these to larger and more theoretical considerations, then Jones learns something about social science. The future teaching of social science will include opportunities for Jones, while he is still a pupil in a secondary school, to get some direct understanding of how social facts are collected and ordered in the elementary aspects of social-science method. The community around the school is at hand, ready to be considered from the point of view of the social scientist, and it will be used more systematically than it is now being used in the future teaching of the social studies. This is one reason for the significance of the topic to which today's program is devoted.

In so far as the teaching of social problems, whether by book or by direct observation of social life, contributes to the fundamental and lasting broadening of knowledge and intelligence which we call a general education it will show how social science, rather than doctrine, or wishful thinking, or common sense, deals with those problems. It will show that social problems have many sides and are interrelated with one another. It will show how these difficulties are surmounted. It will make clear that there are ways of making social knowledge verifiable. It will show something of the methods of proof used in establishing social facts. It will develop respect for those conclusions in the realm of the social which depend upon the consensus of the competent, and it will do this by showing the methods by which these competent ones arrive at consensus. If the teachers of the social studies are able to communicate some of these matters to the young, it will not matter much if the list of problems which they teach is not perfect or if their knowledge of the results of particular research in particular fields is not up to date. It will not then be so serious a matter if the chicken coop comes ashore in a meadow instead of a forest. For then the young person will have learned what there is to know about social science which will help him as an adult citizen under any circumstances of life.

A CONTRIBUTION OF ANTHROPOLOGY TO THE EDUCATION OF THE TEACHER

This is far from the first time that an anthropologist has spoken as such about education and teaching. Two other such occasions have fallen within my own direct experience in recent years, and I have consulted the records of these occasions to learn what I should say on this present occasion. The first occasion was a symposium on "Education and the Cultural Process" held at Fisk University in March, 1941, and the other was a symposium on "Environment and Education" held at the University of Chicago in September of that same year. Altogether nine anthropologists contributed ten papers (**2, 3**) to these two symposiums—all on some aspect of education or teaching as looked upon by an anthropologist. On reading over these papers, I receive a strong impression that, in spite of their apparent diversity, all these anthropologists, are, at bottom, saying the same thing. Consequently I am led to entertain the idea that this is perhaps the only thing that anthropologists have to say, or perhaps that it is the most important thing, and that in either case it is what I had better try once more to say.

BASIC IDEA OF "A CULTURE"

This basic anthropological idea is that every individual lives within something called "a culture"—a body of customs and beliefs which provide satisfaction to his human needs and adjustment to his environment. This culture is thought of as something special to each of the many societies in which mankind lives, and it is the many special cultures, separable and comparable, which these anthropologists are usually thinking about when they talk about education. The people of the Trobriand Islands live within or in terms of a culture which is notably different in content from the culture of the Dakota Indians, and yet it is reported or assumed by these anthropologists that the Trobriand culture does the same thing for the people who happen to live as Trobrianders as that which is done by Dakota culture for the people who happen to be Dakota Indians.

A reading of these ten papers makes it evident that all the contributing anthropologists regard each of these cultures as having a necessary and important character: integration, or wholeness. In words used by Malinowski in his paper, each culture is "an organic unit." The customs and

An address delivered July 25, 1945, at the Fifth Annual Conference for Teachers of the Social Sciences in Secondary Schools and Junior Colleges at the University of Chicago and reproduced with permission from *School Review*, LIII (November, 1945), 516-25.

beliefs which are the parts of the whole are consistent with one another and depend on one another. Mekeel refers to such a culture as "an operational totality" and declares that every culture has "a matrix, a configuration, into which the pieces fit." He denies that a culture "is an index of easily movable items" and tells us that "it must be viewed as a meaningful whole." The Dakota Indians serve chicken and dog meat at a wedding feast, not simply because the two are palatable and available, but because chicken symbolizes the American way of life and dog meat the Indian way; in their situation, marginal to two cultures, both configurations are represented by meaningful symbols in the form of food. Mekeel goes on to tell us that even the ways in which very young children are trained in their excretory habits are consistent with the type of character which is adaptive to, or consistent with, their adult life and that, therefore, these ways of infant training are also parts of the culture, the integrated whole.

Plainly these anthropologists regard integrated culture with favor. They are not indifferent to it; they think it good that there be consistency and wholeness in the culture in terms of which the individual lives his life. The thing which it is thought that a culture does for an individual is a good thing. It is thought that the culture provides the individual with goals, with purpose and significance for his actions, and with the sense that all the activities he carries on are contributory toward realization of these goals. In such a culture the individual knows what he ought to do and finds himself doing it. Conversely, these anthropologists view with alarm attempts to educate without due reference to effects of the education in making the culture less integrated, less whole. Malinowski writes that "the anthropologist recognizes more and more fully how dangerous it is to tamper with any part or aspect of culture, lest unforeseeable consequences occur." As an example he chooses sorcery among African natives, advises caution to anyone trying to educate the natives out of a belief in sorcery, and tells us that, examined in its cultural setting, African sorcery turns out to be a crude but often effective way of managing misfortune, disease, and death and that the natives would be worse off without the sorcery than they are with it. He advises the teacher in Africa to abstain from trying to teach natives not to believe in sorcery, but rather to leave it alone until, by gradual introduction of hygiene and other security-giving modifications, the culture no longer has any place for sorcery, which will of itself disappear. Thus the picture we get of a culture is that of a complex structure in which all the parts are fitted together. The anthropologist tells us not to try to pull out a few pieces that we do not like lest the whole come tumbling down; he wants us to understand the relations of the parts to the whole and, guided by this

knowledge, to accomplish a change in manner of life through gradual substitutions.

This conception of "a culture" is, it seems, a peculiar contribution of anthropology to the understanding of human behavior. It is a conception certainly related to, but not the same as, the conception of "human culture"—that aggregate of invention and institution which began when the first stick or stone was kept and its use was explained by one ancient primate to another. Culture in the general and singular serves to set off all mankind as against all animals. Culture in the particular and the plural serves to set one society off as against another. The idea of separate and comparable cultures, one to a local community, is an outgrowth of intimate study of tribal and peasant life in the past two or three generations. You do not find the conception in the pages of Edward Burnett Tylor or in those of Sumner's *Folkways* (**4**). It appears in the detailed accounts of special primitive groups, finds its most eloquent and persuasive statement in the works of Malinowski, and is expressed also simply and compellingly in Ruth Benedict's *Patterns of Culture* (**1**). As it is an idea that would naturally develop out of the study of the various primitive societies, it has been anthropologists who have developed it.

SIGNIFICANCE TO EDUCATION OF IDEA OF INTEGRATED CULTURE

If this is *the* important, or at least *an* important, contribution of anthropology to the understanding of human living, my assignment is to provide an answer to the question: What is the significance of the conception of integrated cultures to the training of teachers? Fortunately there is guidance in the papers of the symposiums to which I have referred. I will, however, state the matter as I see it and use the suggestions of these other anthropologists without making them responsible for the formulations that I reach.

In the first place, I assert that, merely because each of us, with few exceptions, grows up in one of these cultures and by this fact is limited in his understanding of his own conduct and that of other people, the coming to know another culture than our own should be a great liberalizing experience. I think, therefore, that the giving of this experience is a task of those who shape the programs of general education. The point I here make is thus a point for teachers in so far as teachers, like everybody else, should have a general education of which this element should be a part, and also for teachers in so far as teachers make the programs of general education for other people.

The end in view here is to bring the young person to understand that every normal human being is reared in a society with ways of life characteristic of that society; that these ways "make sense" as one way is seen

to be related to the next, consistent with it and supporting it; that the motives which people have and the values which they embrace are derived, generally speaking, from this traditional culture. The further objective is to lead the young person to look back upon his own culture from the vantage point secured in the understanding gained of other cultures and thus achieve that objectivity and capacity to consider thoughtfully his own conduct and the institutions of his own society which are, in part, a result of thinking as if within another culture. On the one hand, the end is to cause the individual to see that there are ways other than his own which are compatible with human needs and with the dignity of the individual; on the other hand, the end is, through comprehension of another way of life, to develop the power to think well about one's own way of life so that that way may be improved. To some degree the study of anthropology provides this liberalizing experience through the acquaintance it gives with cultures other than our own, and much of the appeal which anthropology has for young people in schools and colleges comes from the fact that it provides such experience. I think this contribution primarily belongs, however, not in the training of anthropologists but in the general education of everybody. How to get it there is something that is yet to be determined.

Because we cannot move a tenth-grade class every afternoon to China or Central Africa, we shall have to teach about these countries chiefly through books and pictures. A principal requirement is time: vicarious acquaintance with, say, Chinese village culture might be sufficiently achieved in one or two years of persisting attention to the subject. I am sure that almost nothing is accomplished toward the end I have in view by the current practice in primary and secondary schools of dividing a year of social studies into short periods in each of which a new subject is taken up, at fortnightly intervals, from Russia to money or minority groups—and, indeed, I doubt that anything very important is accomplished toward any good end. In place of this succession of bowing acquaintances with miscellaneous subjects which are connected, I suppose, in one way or another with the modern world, I suggest the possibility of substituting a persisting and penetrating consideration of some society and culture notably different from our own and well provided with documentation. This might be a principal part of the social-studies curriculum at some place between the ninth and twelfth school years.

SIGNIFICANCE TO TEACHERS OF IDEA OF INTEGRATED CULTURE

This suggestion is an application of the conception of integrated cultures to the making of a curriculum in general education. I turn now to other ways in which the conception may be relevant to teaching. An ap-

plication may be made of the conception of an integrated culture to the teaching activity itself. If cultures consist of an integration of customs and institutions, then teaching itself may be looked at as one such element more or less integrated in the culture of the community in which the teaching is carried out. This point is, indeed, made in several of the anthropological papers contributed to the two symposiums that I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks. Seeing formal education in its relation to other aspects of culture, these anthropologists are struck by its relative unimportance. They remind us at the beginning of their discussion that schooling is only a small part of education in the broad sense, "the process of cultural transmission and renewal." By the time the child comes to the teacher, he has already passed his most formative years, and the informal instruments of education have already largely shaped his world. What the school can do after that is correspondingly limited. Furthermore, what the school can do continues to be limited by the more powerful influences of the home, the play group, and the neighborhood. Do not expect to accomplish more than is possible, say these anthropologists to the teacher, and you may successfully teach that which finds some support, some basis of consistency, with the culture as it is transmitted in informal communication outside the schoolroom. So Mekee is not surprised that Indian children, after many years of residence in government schools, in which attempts are made to teach the ways of white men, so often return to Indian life. So Malinowski warns the teacher in Africa not to separate, by his teaching, the child from the native community where he enjoys the warmth and security of life in an integrated culture. The lesson for the teacher from such observations is that teaching is not to be regarded as a technique of inculcation or of stimulation learned from books or from other teachers and thence applicable to a classroom, as medicine may be administered to a sick man, or fertilizer to a farmer's field. The suggested application is that teaching is effective in so far as it tends toward the development in the young person of a coherent body of attitudes and values adequate to the life-needs in his particular community. The classroom is important only as it is understood in its relation to the society and culture of the children who occupy it, and teaching will be effective only as it is related to society and culture.

Being established in the viewpoint of culture as an organic unity, anthropologists seem to be calling upon the teacher to understand, not so much teaching methods, as the community in which the teaching takes place. The real nature of effective teaching, these anthropologists are in effect declaring, lies, not in ways of preparing instruction units nor in devices for testing reading comprehension, but rather in the part played

by the school and by what goes on in the school in the cultural life of the children's community. I suspect that in this the anthropologists are telling the teachers to look to matters which teachers in fact do constantly look to because they cannot help it, even though these are not matters that bulk large in the formal training of teachers. In one of the symposium papers Warner looks at the school in the community as he would look at initiation rites in a primitive society, as from the outside. He finds that the high school in the American towns that he has studied is one of many institutions which express and maintain, among other things, the system of ranking according to social status which characterizes the society. The lower-class pupils study commercial and technical courses. The upper-class children take courses that prepare them for college. The children of each class are taught what will fit them for the station in life which it is expected they will assume. Moreover, he finds a marked tendency to classify children in supposed intelligence groups according to the social positions of their parents, so that a child from the upper class is not put in the lowest intelligence group even if his individual performance might put him there. Still further, he finds that what teachers do to warp theoretically impartial educational procedures to fit the local cultures is done largely because the same result is accomplished anyway by the informal groupings of children in and out of the school. The children's cliques bring about an assorting of children according to their parents' social positions, and the school, in effect, is conforming to these other less visible institutions. Warner is thus applying the conception of an integrated culture to the school and its community. "Understand these," he seems to say to the teacher, "if you would understand what your teaching does, can do, and cannot do."

SIGNIFICANCE OF IDEA OF CULTURE IN MODERN SCHOOLS

The possibility that teaching will not be integrated with the rest of the cultural life of the child is, obviously, increased to the degree that the teacher represents a way of life different from that of the child. The possibility will be very great when an outsider comes to teach in a native community, whether the community be one of Africans or Indians or Kentucky mountaineers. Missionary teaching is often ineffective or disintegrating because it is not related or is unwisely related to the local culture. But the same danger exists, in compound form, in urban schools where the children represent not one integrated culture but many disintegrated cultures, and the teacher not only does not, but could not, teach to develop a single coherent integration if he wanted to. What, then, is the significance of the conception of the individual in one integrated culture in connection with teaching in a society where there is no integrated culture? What is the value of this anthropological concep-

tion, developed in primitive society, in modern urban society? It is all very well for the anthropologist to advise the teacher what he may do or even should do in teaching Indians or native Africans, but what can the anthropologist helpfully tell the modern teacher in a modern school?

Half of the answer depends on the extent to which the modern city community is like an Indian tribe or an African village, and part of this half of the answer is given by Warner when he, in effect, urges the student of teaching to study the school in its community. If the student does so, he will find the extent to which the school is integrated with other institutions and helps to perpetuate a local culture. Part of this same half of the answer is expressed in Mead's paper read at the Fisk University symposium. This anthropologist considers the function, not of the school in the community, but of the whole institution of education in modern society, as if she were studying warfare in New Guinea. She finds that its function is different from the function of education in primitive societies. In primitive societies education depends, she says, on the will to learn something that everybody assumes one would want to learn. In modern society it depends on the will to teach something that somebody thinks ought to be taught, even though not everybody wants to learn it. This different nature of education in modern society leads, she goes on to tell us, to a conception of education as something that may not so much perpetuate an old society as make a new one. The society it may make is so new that none of us living now is able to say what it will be, and yet it is supposed that these children whom you and I educate, or their children, will make that society and that the kind of education we give them will somehow fit them for doing so. This is indeed a far cry from the way in which a tribal Indian or isolated African native would look at the educational institutions of his own society. He thinks of education, so far as he thinks of it at all, as something that will perpetuate the kind of life which he has always known. Mead is telling us that, just as modern society is different, in kind, from all primitive societies, taken as another kind, so education is and must be different.

What is this difference in the two kinds of societies or cultures? In the paper that she contributed to the Chicago symposium, Mead enumerates three differences: (1) Primitive cultures are homogeneous, while ours is heterogeneous. (2) Primitive cultures change very slowly, while ours changes rapidly and constantly. (3) The population stocks of primitive societies are relatively less diversified than are ours. Mead thereby recognizes that modern urban culture is different in kind from all primitive societies. As the culture is changing rapidly and constantly, there cannot be one well-integrated culture. What children do is different from what adults do, and indeed adults come to think—some of them—that it

is right that children do something different. Moreover, the changes come so rapidly that during the school years of one individual he may be taught completely inconsistent ideas. Benedict, in her paper, makes this point. There are periods when we tell children to be saving of money; there are others when it is a public duty to spend. There have been recent periods when war was unexceptionally evil and "the earth was unanimous for peace," and there have been more recent periods when, as she says, you might go to jail for saying so. As our culture is always changing and is never integrated, Benedict concludes that "education in our world today must prepare our children to adapt themselves to unforeseeable conditions."

At this point is is apparent that the conception of an integrated culture has undergone some significant alteration. The anthropologists to whom we have looked for guidance began by telling us that every individual lives in a well-integrated culture. Now some of them seem to be confirming our suspicions that, in the case of our own society, no individual does. The question may then be repeated: What is the significance of the conception of the individual in one integrated culture in connection with teaching in a society where there is no one integrated culture? Again, the first half of the answer may be repeated: In some degree, as in Warner's studies of the place of the school in the status system, there is integration in modern society, and the school is part of that integration. But the other half of the answer may be given also. The value of the conception of the individual in a well-integrated culture lies, in part, in the suggestive contrast between our own case and the case of the stable primitive societies. We should not so well see the peculiar problems and responsibilities of modern education if we did not see modern education as a special and variant case of education in all societies. That it is special and variant is expressly stated by Mead. In stable societies with well-integrated cultures, all educative influences, she says, operate simultaneously and consistently upon the individual, and she has illustrated this fact vividly in her series of photographs showing the treatment accorded babies in Bali. But in our heterogeneous and changing society there is a qualitative difference, she says; what the radio says may be quite unrelated to what mother says to baby, and what mother-in-law over in the corner manages to convey by a gesture is emphatically in contradiction. It is the inconsistencies, the lack of integration, that make our society different from stable primitive societies. In a sort of definition by indefinition, it is this lack of integration which gives our society its character. Interestingly enough, of all the contributors to these two symposiums, it is not an anthropologist but a psychiatrist, Franz Alexander, who says this most plainly. "Paradoxically stated," he

says, "the pattern of our world is that it has no fixed pattern." For the psychiatrist the significance of this conclusion lies in the need to study individual careers in terms of individual life-histories. For the teacher the significance lies in the need to develop the capacities of the individual to deal with circumstances which the teacher cannot foresee.

THE TEACHER'S TASK

The conception of one integrated culture leads, therefore, to a view of the task of the teacher which sees it as double. The conception is helpful to the teacher, in part because it is directly applicable to the child in "this" school in "this" community. The conception is helpful, in part because it is not directly applicable. The apparent contradiction is resolved by distinguishing the short run in time and the local setting from the long run in time and the wider setting. So far as the short span of years is concerned, and in the local neighborhood (especially if that neighborhood be in one of the more stable towns and not in a community of rapidly changing population), the school will be found reasonably well integrated with the rest of the cultural life, and what can be accomplished by the teacher will be limited by these relationships which it is, therefore, necessary for him to understand. On the other hand, the school is an instrument for social change and is accepted as such, both by laymen and by educational leaders. For example, while it is true, as Warner says, that the high school perpetuates the status system of the community, it is also true, as Mead says in her paper read at Fisk University, that education is a recognized means by which the individual may leave his social rank and move to another. For the more remote future, education, to us, exists to develop powers to deal with contingencies beyond our powers of prediction. Children are to be educated so as to find what personal and cultural security they can find in the communities that now exist, and they are also to be educated to make, by effort and understanding, new integrations out of whatever pieces of living the future may bring them. The teacher today is both a perpetuator of an old integration and a builder of the power to meet disintegration. If a paradox remains, it is not one that I have invented; it exists in the nature of modern life.

REFERENCES

1. Benedict, Ruth. *Patterns of Culture*. New York, 1934.
2. *Education and the Cultural Process*. Papers presented at a symposium commemorating the seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding of Fisk University, April 29–May 4, 1941. Edited by Charles S. Johnson. Reprinted from the *American Journal of Sociology*, XLVIII (May, 1943). Individual papers of special interest to educators are:

MEAD, MARGARET. "Our Educational Emphases in Primitive Perspective," pp. 5–11.

REDFIELD, ROBERT. "Culture and Education in the Midwestern Highlands of Guatemala," pp. 12–20.

MALINOWSKI, BRONISLAW. "The Pan-African Problem of Culture Contact," pp. 21–37.

WATKINS, MARK HANNA. "The West African 'Bush' School," pp. 38–47.

MEKEEL, SCUDDER. "Education, Child-training, and Culture," pp. 48–53.

BENEDICT, RUTH. "Transmitting Our Democratic Heritage in the Schools," pp. 94–99.

HERSKOVITS, MELVILLE J. "Education and Cultural Dynamics," pp. 109–21.

POWDERMAKER, HORTENSE. "The Channeling of Negro Aggression by the Cultural Process," pp. 122–30.

3. *Environment and Education.* A symposium held in connection with the fiftieth anniversary celebration at the University of Chicago. *Supplementary Educational Monographs,* No. 54. Chicago, 1942. Papers presented at the symposium are:

BURGESS, ERNEST W. "Educative Effects of Urban Environment," pp. 1–15.

WARNER, W. LLOYD. "Educative Effects of Social Status," pp. 16–28.

ALEXANDER, FRANZ. "Educative Influence of Personality Factors in the Environment," pp. 29–47.

MEAD, MARGARET. "Educative Effects of Social Environment as Disclosed by Studies of Primitive Societies," pp. 48–61.

ALEXANDER, FRANZ. "Additional Remarks," pp. 62–66.

4. SUMNER, WILLIAM GRAHAM. *Folkways: A Study of the Sociological Importance of Usages, Manners, Customs, Mores, and Morals.* Boston, 1907.

THE STUDY OF CULTURE IN GENERAL EDUCATION

An anthropologist may be expected to talk about culture, and he will be understood to mean by that word the whole integrated traditional body of ways of doing, thinking, and feeling that give a social group its character. The burden of my remarks today can be put in a single sentence, and I may well put that sentence first: Understanding of the nature of culture and of human nature is something which the social studies can contribute to general education.

In the latter part of this paper I hope to say more of what I mean by culture, and also of human nature, why I think that understanding of these conceptions is a part of general education, and how the communication of that understanding might be accomplished by teachers of the social studies. I am assuming that I may talk, not only about the social studies as they are now taught, but also as we might like them to be taught. As a teacher of the social studies in a four-year college including the eleventh to the fourteenth school years—an occupation which just now takes almost all my time—I am well aware of how far what I am doing falls short of what I would like to do.

This is not all I assume, and to state some further assumptions I am making will help to show how I come to the principal proposition about the place of an understanding of culture and human nature in a program of general education.

In first place, perhaps, is the assumption that there is an education which is substantially the same for everyone, an education that is independent of the sex, class, race, or occupation of the educated individual. Perhaps your agreement with this assumption—a sort of central axiom in general education—may be taken for granted. The assumption allows us to change our teaching to take account of individual differences, but it holds that much of what is taught in those years of schooling which most children and young people pass through ought to be the same for all and ought to be directed not to preparation for any special task but to the freeing of the mind and spirit and to preparation for the common responsibilities and opportunities of citizenship.

A second assumption is also one you will probably share with me. It is the assumption that in our changing and unpredictable world general education must somehow combine two objectives which appear antithetical: it must develop individuality and adaptiveness to change, and it must also provide us with common understandings. The individual

Reproduced with permission from *Social Education*, XI (October, 1947), 259–64.

must be able to make decisions on matters which tradition cannot and should not control. On the other hand, we have to have some common tradition to begin with, or we cannot act together at all. In the words of the Harvard report on general education: "this . . . raises . . . one of the most fundamental problems of education, indeed, of society itself: how to reconcile this necessity for common beliefs with the equally obvious necessity for new and independent insights leading to change."[1]

Perhaps we can find elements for a program of general education which do both. This is my view. I think, as a third assumption, that there are elements of that education, which everybody can and should have, which both make for consensus in society and also develop in the individual the power to make free rational choices. In a moment I shall mention some of these.

A fourth assumption requires a fuller exposition than the others and may well be the point at which some of you will separate yourselves from my views. It is the assumption that our task is to identify some of the elements of this education for everybody in a form more general than particular courses or instructional units but in a form more special than is provided in the usual definitions.

At one extreme, we define general education in terms of education for the good life, or for citizenship, or as effecting the development of very general qualities of mind and character. The abilities identified in the Harvard report as those toward which education for everybody should move fairly represent, I think, this manner of defining it in general terms. The report says that the aim is to bring it about that the generally educated are able "to think effectively, to communicate thought, to make relevant judgments, to discriminate among values." No one can object to such a statement, but it does not tell us very much.

At the other extreme, we define general education in terms of courses. Yet such definition of a program in general education is a definition for a particular school, because it is an allocation of resources within the powers of that school. It cannot be a definition for all schools.

Nevertheless, if general education is to provide for the common enlightenment of all, it should be possible to say of what this enlightenment is to consist, more specially than is said when it is defined in terms of general qualities of the mind, and more generally than is proposed in a series of courses.

Imagine, if you please, young people exposed to, say, fourteen years of general education, and imagine examiners set to examine these young people in the field of the social studies. I do not advocate a uniform national examination system to be applied to all schools; I evoke these

[1] "General Education in a Free Society," pp. 46–47.

examiners merely to help find the middle ground of definition of general education as to man in society. What would these examiners use as their guides in preparing the examination? They cannot use the courses of any one school, because these courses do and should differ. The definitions in terms of preparation for citizenship or of the ability to think, communicate, judge, and discriminate do point out the direction in which they are to inquire and test, but are still too general to give them much guidance. One thinks, communicates, judges, and discriminates about something, and what is that something in the case of the social studies?

Can we not help these imagined examiners, and so, more importantly, help ourselves, by stating what kinds of understanding or thinking about what subject matter do we believe to constitute elements common to all our efforts to bring about general education in the social studies?

We can come to a recognition of such elements either by looking at what we are teaching in different schools and colleges to see what in fact are its common elements, or we can reflect upon what we know about man in society and try to determine what elements of that knowledge would best meet the double need of modern education: the establishment of consensus and the capacity to adapt and to change. Today I am doing a little of both.

Looking first at the program of general education in the social sciences which I know best—that of the College of the University of Chicago—and casting a look or two at programs in other schools, I seem to find at least two principal elements. There is nothing startling about these. I suppose them to be present, more or less, in many programs of general education in the social studies and to find more or less explicit recognition. I hope merely to make the recognition a little more explicit.

For one thing we are trying to communicate understanding of the historical development of contemporary society, especially of our own Western and American society, and still more specially of some of the principal values of that society. This is to say that an element of general education contributed by the social studies is knowledge of how we, in this society, came to hold precious liberty, equality, government by the people, and other conceptions which go to make up our way of life both as it is and as we wish it to be. In this element of general education the emphasis is upon the past thoughts and the past events which have shaped present thoughts and present events.

For another thing we are trying to convey some understanding of the scientific spirit as applied to social problems of the present day and the capacity to address oneself in that spirit to such a problem. The social problems we have in mind form no fixed list; we suppose the gen-

erally educated person can show his competence with regard to almost any of them: the problem of maintaining control by the people of their government under the conditions of mass publics which attend us today; the problem of choice among various policies with regard to free or controlled economic competition; the problems of means and ends involved in assuring in our society a chosen combination of freedom and of regulation. The educated person will be able to use the thoughts of those who have written best on such questions in the past and will know what sorts of particular relevant facts need be taken into account in the seeking of solutions. Further, he has a moral as well as an intellectual attitude toward such problems: it is part of general education to develop the will to do something about these matters, to work out one's own views about them—whatever convictions they may lead to—and then to act on those convictions.

While in the first element of general education in the social studies the emphasis is on the historical development of our institutions and values, in this second element the emphasis is on a problem of common living and on analysis of the assumptions and particular facts which go to make the problem and to limit the terms of the possible solutions.

I say again that I suppose these two elements to be in fact represented in many curriculums of the social studies. They are in effect represented in the report of the Harvard Committee in those pages where it is recommended that the high school teach something about modern civilization with focus on Europe, American history with understanding of modern problems, and a course dealing with the nature of contemporary society, and in other pages where it is proposed that Harvard itself offer as part of a program of general education courses in Western Thought and Institutions and in American Democracy. How the courses are to be arranged is secondary. What is primary, in my view, is identification of those differentiated capacities to do what with what subject matter, toward the attainment of which any program of general education in the social studies ought to be directed. Historical knowledge of the development of our values and analytical understanding of facts and assumptions relevant to the formation of reasoned convictions on important contemporary social problems are, I think, two of these.

These two are rightly present in programs of general education in the social science. By communicating and restating important parts of our own heritage and by developing a common responsibility to realize common values, the presence of these two elements in a program of general education helps to bring about consensus. By throwing responsibility on the individual to work out his own convictions through reason and the use of special knowledge, they develop capacities to deal with the vicissitudes of rapid social change.

The task of this paper is to identify another such element of general education as to man in society in the study of culture and human nature. Before dealing with this third element briefly some observations may be offered relative to the two elements just defined.

If general education in the social sciences were to include these two elements and no others, then such education would be exclusively concerned with our own traditions, our own history, our own system of values. The history that is taught to bring about the understanding and capacity these elements call for is a history of the Western world—especially of the United States—and of the values that characterize our particular tradition. When comparisons are made in courses in history or on social problems, the comparisons are likely to be within the European-American tradition. The world in which we now live, however, is one in which account must be taken of many people with many different heritages and different systems of values. If general education were to be concerned exclusively with our history and with our problems seen only in the light of our tradition it might be a dangerously limited education. It might not provide the individual with the elements of understanding of other ways of life than his own, or with the means of sympathetic understanding of other peoples.

In the second place it may be observed that the two elements of general education just identified attack the subject matter of the social in only two of what I take to be the three ways in which it can be attacked. One considers the subject matter as history, as events that have produced something known today. The other looks at the social as problems to be dealt with, as particular issues of policy, as choices to be made by actors in the world's affairs. The third way of looking at the subject matter of the social is by analysis with the use of concepts. By this third view the social consists of genera of natural phenomena—societies, social relations, customs, institutions, states, economies, and so forth. If the social is so regarded, one sees the common characteristics of many or all societies, of many or all men, and sees the differences among them as representing sub-classes of natural phenomena. The histories of societies are themselves compared and generalized upon. And the problems of our own society are merely the points at which this generalizing form of regarding the social may make a fresh beginning.

The conceptual way of looking at the social is of course a characteristic viewpoint of research, especially as research seeks comprehensive generalization. But it is also, I think, necessary to approach the social through history or through analysis of social problems. We do not communicate anything about the particular except through common understanding of general terms. We need, even for the simplest teaching of the social studies, some common language about the social. The ques-

tion here to be considered is how far is the exposition of a language for describing the social to go beyond common speech in the giving of a general education.

The instruction in the social studies in which I take part does include exposition of concepts, but my impression is that the concepts are not well developed in relation to concrete facts. In one course known to me too many concepts are presented too formally and too briefly. Concepts are like friends; you have to work with them for some time before you have them at their best; and, like friends, concepts are best when you do not try to have too many.

These considerations prepare the way for my main proposal: that some understanding of human nature and culture is an element which the social studies may contribute to general education. The line of thought may be summarized. In seeking other elements of general education to be provided by the social studies we may try to supplement historical knowledge of our society and its values, and analytical competence as to social problems. The supplement called for should provide some of the elementary conceptual language in which the social is understood in its universal aspects. It should also provide access to understanding of peoples and ways of life other than our own. The suggestion is that some exploration of culture and of human nature meets these requirements. I think we are now providing this element to some degree, but not clearly and explicitly.

Do the schools that organize instruction around the culture of a certain people at a certain epoch give an understanding of the nature of culture? What do I mean by "an understanding of culture"?

I mean in the first place, acquaintance, familiarity, penetrating sympathetic comprehension of one culture other than one's own. From this first point of view the coming to know another culture is like coming to know a personality. The culture, like the personality, is seen as a persisting integration of dispositions to behave. It is unique, complex, self-consistent. A culture, like a personality, is a way of life. It is the way of life of a particular society. Seen so, it is just one thing, that one way of life. To come to know it takes much time, as it takes much time to know a personality intimately. But while we all have abundant opportunity to come to know personalities different from our own and in this knowledge come to see our own persons freshly and more wisely, not many of us have the opportunity, in ordinary living, to come to gain a good acquaintance with another culture.

The culture I am thinking of is one among many cultures. It is not culture in the generic of which I am thinking, the inventions, arts, and ideas of all mankind, those characteristics which set off man from the animals. I am thinking of the local and special forms of "culture," of culture in

the sense in which the culture of the Andaman Islanders is one thing and that of the Chinese peasants is another. A contribution to general education which can be made by the social studies is the provision of opportunity to come to know one such culture more or less well. What culture is chosen is a secondary matter; it is more important that the fact and nature of "a culture" be undersood than that any particular one be understood rather than another.

The understanding had of the unfamiliar culture, in my view, must reach the point where the educated individual begins to think how he would act in given situations if that other culture were his own. The individual educated as to another culture recognizes that the institutions and ideas of the other people are coherent and provide those who live in terms of them with a system of values which give, for them, worthy meaning to effort and provide goals toward which to strive. Further, the understanding must reach the point where one sees human nature freshly. One must get beyond the culture to those elements in the behavior of the people which are, after all, the same as one's own. For as one comes to understand people who live by institutions and values different from one's own, at the same time one comes to see that those people are, nevertheless, at bottom quite like one's own people. The alien culture at first appears to us as a mask, enigmatic or repugnant. On closer acquaintance we see it as a garment for the spirit; we understand its harmonies and appreciate them. Finally, as acquaintance goes deeper still, we do not see, or for a time forget, the culture but look only to the common humanity of the men and women beneath.

To describe this process of getting acquainted with people with a culture different from our own is to recognize the experience as liberalizing. We are all limited in our understanding of our own conduct and that of our neighbors because we see everything by the preconceptions offered by our own culture. It is a task of education to provide a viewpoint from which the educated person may free himself from the limitations of these preconceptions. We are all islanders to begin with. An acquaintance with another culture, a real and deep acquaintance, is a release of the mind and the spirit from that isolation. It is to learn a universal language.

There is another way in which acquaintance with another culture is a major contribution to the education of every American. This is because the people of our country do not live in terms of a culture in quite the same sense in which the Andaman Islanders did or the Chinese peasants do. Cultures differ, not only in their content, in what values they emphasize; they also differ in the degree to which the values and institutions they provide are consistent and harmonious and in the extent to which they are uniformly acceptable to the people who live by them. The culture of the people of the United States is an entity much less well defined

than the cultures of most of the peoples of history and of the world today. In this sense contemporary Americans need acquaintance with a well-integrated culture because they have never had any. And rational understanding of contemporary social problems—another element in general education—requires, it seems to me, some understanding of this fact. Ability to address oneself in the scientific spirit toward a problem of American life requires understanding of the fact that the consensual basis for common agreement found in a well-integrated culture is here lacking in no small degree. And one can talk about this in general terms for hundreds of hours, I feel, without conveying real understanding of it. If one has intensive acquaintance with one society in which the culture is well integrated, the difference between that situation and our own is really understood. I doubt if one can come to understand it in any other way.

Is it possible to get this kind of acquaintance with a culture by study, in the schools? I really do not know. But I am hopeful. I do have some views as to some of the decisions one would make if one tried seriously to provide intensive acquaintance with another culture. One would devote a long time to one culture. I am sure that it is better to devote much time to one or a very few than to spend a short time with each of many. Two years seems to me a short time in which, at secondhand, to come to know a culture. If the program of teaching the social studies were planned as a whole, from the first to, say, the fourteenth year, one might be able to make the understanding of one principal culture, with interruptions and digressions to consider comparable materials from other cultures, a major business of the entire period of fourteen years.

The primary teaching materials would consist of personal accounts of life in the society chosen for special study. Included would be autobiographies, letters, accounts of personal relations between Americans and members of the foreign group, and good fiction about the society. There are several reasons why one might choose a literate society, such as China; one reason lies in the availability of books written by members of that society. If China were chosen, one would read the classic and popular Chinese novels, as well as collections of popular lore. There is a great deal of such literature in English now, from many unfamiliar societies. Even the pre-literate societies are now represented in intimate and revealing personal accounts of life as seen by Indians, Africans, Laplanders, and as written or spoken by members of these societies. I need only refer to the plastic and graphic arts. The pupil would make his acquaintance with the unfamiliar people through every kind of record expressive of their ways of living and thinking.

This becoming acquainted with culture would involve at the same time a becoming acquainted with human nature. This means that the young

person is encouraged to recognize two kinds of universals having to do with human nature: one, the presence in our own and other societies of recurrent social types; and two, the presence under all cultures of a common humanity which makes it possible for all people to understand one another in some degree, about some things. Therefore the accounts of the alien culture will be read not only to get acquaintance with that culture, but also to meet again the types of personality which one meets in Boston or Chicago, and the common humanity one knows at home. Turi's *Book of Lapland* is a personal account of Lapp culture; it is also a self-portrait of a prudent and practical man. The Chinese novel *All Men Are Brothers* is an account of life among those forced to the edges of the more stable Chinese society of the thirteenth century; in it also we meet types of adventures known to us from the literature of our own tradition. So this early study of culture and human nature will gain contributions from literature of our own heritage which illuminates human nature and defines social types. It can be imagined that *The Egoist, Fathers and Sons,* and Plutarch's *Lives* could be read in comparison with novels and autobiographies from China or other cultures foreign to us. So would understanding be gained of humanity in its two basic organized forms—culture and personality—against their common element, human nature.

I have just had in view the understanding of culture and human nature as it might be reached in the earlier years of schooling. In this first acquaintance the subject matter would appear in its concrete individuality. The first objective is the enrichment of experience with these basic aspects of the human. At this level little or no formal language of analysis is needed; the terms of common sense are sufficient. Nor is it needful at this beginning to think of the study as definitely the business of social science or as that of the humanities. It is both.

I suppose, however, that as the pupil moves from the earlier years of schooling to the secondary school and then to the first years of the college, the treatment of culture and of human nature may become, so far as the social studies are concerned, more abstract and systematic—in a word, more scientific. Indeed, the basic concepts of culture, personality, and human nature are needed in the minds of those who make the program of teaching and carry it into account from the very first primary grades. They come to the pupils as they develop capacity to use scientific concepts, and as—and this is the important point—they have gained such intimate and rich acquaintance with materials as to make the concepts really useful in the ordering and control of their world. I repeat the observation that concepts talked about away from materials are mere word-play.

I suppose that the more abstract and systematic consideration of cul-

ture and human nature may be developed in the tenth to the fourteenth years into a consideration of the subject matter of the social in the third of the three ways, which have been identified already in the course of my remarks. This is the way of social science considered, not as history, not as a rational and empirical consideration of problems of social action, but as a more or less systematic description of social phenomena as orderly aspects of the universe. So may the study of human nature and culture provide understanding of a few fundamental concepts.

You will see that not only do I suppose that human nature and culture are elements of understanding of our world which enter directly into the substance of a general or liberal education, but that I also think of them as primary concepts in the scientific description of man in society. So does common sense. We hear it said, "People are all alike." On the other hand it is said that East is East and West is West and never the twain shall meet. It is perhaps enough to add that "culture" and its closely related term, "society," are more inclusive conceptions than any such more special term as "government," "state," "market," "tribe," or "family." An understanding of culture and society, as concepts, should lead to understanding of related concepts in the books of social science that are read in the latter part of a program of general education: the works of such social philosophers and social scientists as Aristotle, Machiavelli, Locke, Mill, Maine, and Sumner. The imaginary examiners of young people exposed to fourteen years of general education in the social studies might be imagined to ask questions as to the relation of "culture" to "the mores," as to the relation of the concept of "institutions" to that of "culture," and as to the translatability of the primary terms used in one great work in the social-science field to terms used in another. It would seem appropriate if the examiners asked questions including such other related or dependent conceptions as to culture and society as "value" and "status." In the same way the conception of human nature, beginning as an awareness of the varied and yet stable characteristics of men in societies, might become a part of the more abstract and interrelated body of terms and general ideas by the aid of which understanding is extended and systematized, so the developing analysis of human nature would lead to the distinction between original nature and human nature, to the varied assumptions about and to some of the observations that have been made about differences between individuals and groups as to original nature; to the sharper determination of elements of human nature which exist in all cultures; to understanding of the nature and genesis of personality. My impression is that the young college people I know who, as a part of their general education, read Locke and Bentham and Sumner, become aware of the fact that assumptions as to human nature underlie the views of these writers. But I also have the impression that they are unprepared to

judge these assumptions and that some acquaintance with human nature as a scientific subject matter would make their reading of these works more enlightening to them.

The examples I have given as to directions in which the understanding of culture and of human nature might be developed in the latter part of a program of general education in the social studies point to anthropology and sociology or social psychology as sources of help in the development of this part of a program of general education. I admit to supposing that these sciences are concerned with some matters more fundamental for general education than are some of the others. I think, indeed, that a part of what these sciences have been saying does not properly belong in the upper division where they have been saying it, but belongs in a properly planned program of general education.

But I should not like my remarks to be taken as essentially advocacy of any particular science in the making of a program of general education in the social studies. I will state the points I wish to emphasize. I think that progress will be made in improving the contribution of the social studies to general education as we identify the elements of understanding and capacity, referring to just what subject matter we decide to be of first importance. I think that historical knowledge of the development of the values of recent Western society, especially of our own, is one such element. I think that the ability to analyze present-day problems with the use of reason and special knowledge is another. I do not know how many other such elements of comparable importance we shall come to recognize. I would think that the social studies would be doing their task not so badly if they developed these two elements of knowledge and capacity, and if to them they added, more effectively and explicitly than I think they now do, one more. This third element is the intensive acquaintance with the facts of integrated culture and the fact of human nature and the development upon this acquaintance of a basic generalizing knowledge of society and human nature with some primary scientific concepts for the description and further understanding of that subject matter. To bring about the better weaving of this third thread into the texture of general education in the social studies, I would hope for the power to plan the curriculum of the entire group of years devoted to general education as one task. For the improvement of the work of the earlier years, where acquaintance with culture and human nature is extended, I feel pretty strongly that the reading of much firsthand personal and humanist source materials is demanded. These, in my view, are to be read as they come to us in translation; they are to become source books, not textbooks; we must have the words in which people express themselves as they said or wrote them. The task of bringing these materials together will be a pleasant one; I hope I may join with you in performing it.